

Present Capabilities to Comply with the ESA of 1973

As of 11 November 1978, the BLM has 249 fisheries and wildlife biologists on board. The breakdown by numbers and areas is as follows:

Washington, D.C.	6
Denver Service Center	5
Alaska	9
Arizona	18
California	23
Colorado	22
Eastern States	3
Idaho	22
Montana	26
Nevada	22
New Mexico	15
Oregon	35
Utah	22
Wyoming	18
Outer Continental Shelf	3
Total	<u>249</u>

Within the total 249 biologists, only 2 could be listed as working totally on endangered species, and that is stretching it. We all have other duties as assigned. I myself function as the lead in Washington on nongame species as well as the endangered species liaison officer. Mr. Ken Walker, endangered plant coordinator, will cover the number of botanists we have working on plants.

PANEL: PART IV,
SUMMARY OF THE ENDANGERED PLANT PROGRAM
IN THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Kenneth G. Walker¹

I'll explain very briefly our function in the Washington office. You may wonder why there are two of us here from the Bureau of Land Management. The primary reason is, because of the organizational structure at the Washington office, the responsibility for en-

SUMMARY

Intensified public concern for our environment and the flora and fauna within it has created a demand for all levels of government to engage in active and positive programs to stem the tide of wildlife extinction. We have embarked on an ambitious program to protect and benefit endangered plants and wildlife. Many of our avenues to success are clouded by complex, competitive demands on endangered species habitat by other resource uses and the nation's need for energy. Unraveling ecological complexities to isolate and solve habitat-related problems is not a simple task. Funding and manpower are not available to meet all needs. Despite these difficulties and constraints, we are devoting our best efforts trying to insure that no additional plant or animal become either endangered or extinct on public lands.

LITERATURE CITED

- U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION AND U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE. 1978. Interagency cooperation regulations, Endangered Species Act of 1973. Federal Register 43(2):869-876. January 4.
- U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT. 1977. Annual statistical wildlife report. Unpublished report. Washington, D.C.
- _____. 1977. BLM statistics for 1976. Washington, D.C.
- U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE. 1978. Determination of five plants as endangered species. Federal Register 43: 44810-44812.

dangered species coordination is in the Division of Wildlife, with Dick Vernimen as the coordinator for the Bureau of Land Management. My function in the Division of Watershed is to assist or carry on the coordinating role for endangered plant species. The sym-

¹Endangered Plant Coordinator, U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.

posium, I feel, has been very enlightening. The scientific community in many instances seems to be at odds as to what really needs to be done for endangered species, what the needs are, and what the protection systems should be. We in the federal agencies do not have many options, although we have our opinions. Our options are limited to the methods for which we follow the dictates of legislation.

Policy for endangered plant species is very similar to that described by the Forest Service. Our prime effort is not only to protect and conserve listed species, but also to carry it a step further and to protect and conserve the proposed species with the idea that if we can manage these species and their habitat the situation will be avoided where they will require official listing. We recently developed a policy for endangered species which I will summarize. It is the policy to protect, conserve, and manage federally and state-listed or proposed listings of sensitive, endangered, or threatened plants and to use its authorities in furtherance of the purposes of the Endangered Species Act and similar state laws. The bureau, through its actions in all planning and management activities, will insure that the actions authorized, funded, or carried out will not jeopardize the continued existence of such species or result in the destruction or modification of the critical habitats. To summarize the policy, as the Forest Service mentioned, our intent is to not only follow the letter of the law, but also the spirit of the law. We have issued several guidelines to our field office to follow this policy. In doing this, we have asked our field office to do two things: first, to add each candidate or listed species which is known or expected to occur within their area of responsibility to a list of these species that will be developed and maintained by our state directors within the area of jurisdiction. The area of responsibility in Utah, for example, would be the entire state, which in turn requires a lot of coordination with the universities, state agencies, private concerns, and others, wherever we can acquire the interest. A second appeal would be for state directors to deter-

mine those species which are known or suspected to occur on bureau-administered lands or can reasonably be expected to be influenced by bureau actions. The Bureau of Land Management has the responsibility for management of surface areas, but there also are many areas where we have responsibility for the subsurface minerals management. Coal, in Utah, is an example where we manage the subsurface minerals but, we do not own the surface. This creates many problems.

I will now summarize the program status for the endangered species program in the BLM. I feel almost embarrassed sitting by the Forest Service people when they talk about their funding levels. Our funding for endangered plant species has not been a direct funding effort. We've acquired from other programs approximately \$400,000. This includes partial funding of about 40 personnel. Unfortunately, not very many of them are able to spend their full-time in the endangered species effort. We do have a few full-time botanists. The endangered plant program in this bureau is viewed as low priority because of its magnitude. On public lands, only three species have officially been listed. All three of them are in California. We have several hundred proposed species located on public lands. Our endangered plant species program is primarily, at least at this time, as Duane Atwood mentioned this morning, in the inventory stage. We're not yet to the point where we're really able to prepare or do active planning for a particular species or a particular group of species. Our efforts are tied rather closely to our Environmental Statement (ES) Program in the bureau, particularly the range program, which is a unanimous effort. We have several hundred environmental impact statements to prepare within the next few years. Our endangered species inventory efforts have pretty much centered around ES efforts. Our efforts and methods in conducting these inventories are varied. Some are done in-house by our own people. Many of them we are able to conduct through contracts with universities and others who have such capability.